

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 35-78 are now pending. Applicant has canceled claims 1-34 and added claims 35-78 to clarify the subject matter of the invention.

The newly added claims recite that a sequence of components are identified when the first packet of a message is processed. Subsequently received packets of a message are processed by those components without having to re-identify the sequence of components. For example, claim 35 recites "for the first packet of the message, . . . storing an indication of each of the identified components so that the sequence does not need to be re-identified for subsequent packets of the message."

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 22, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Feiken reference. The Feiken reference does not teach or suggest the identification of a sequence of components when a first packet of a message is received as recited by claims 35-78. Moreover, the Feiken reference teaches that packets of a message are processed in the same manner (e.g., decrypted) at each packet processing device. Thus, the Feiken reference does not disclose identifying a "sequence of components" as recited by the claims, since only one component is used, albeit in multiple processing devices, by the packets of a message.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Hluchyj reference. The Hluchyj reference neither teaches nor suggests that state information is stored when one packet is processed for use when a subsequent packet of the same message is processed as recited by claims 35-78. Moreover, the Hluchyj reference neither teaches nor suggests identifying a sequence of components. Applicant notes that the inter-networking nodes (e.g., 218) convert from one type of network packet to another type of network packet. Since these nodes perform a fixed conversion, there is no need to "identify a sequence of components."



The Examiner rejected claims 19-21, 31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Van Loo reference. These claims were directed to a data structure. None of the pending claims are directed to a data structure.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated September 23, 2002, are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 583-8548.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: February 24, 2003



Maurice J. Pirio
Registration No. 33,273

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 583-8888